arXiv:1301.1728v2 [gr-qc] 14 Mar 2013

On Hořava-Lifshitz Cosmology

Samuel Lepe and Joel Saavedra

Instituto de Física, Pontificia Universidad Católica

de Valparaíso, Casilla 4950, Valparaíso, Chile.

(Dated: March 15, 2013)

Abstract

We are discuss the behavior of Hořava-Lifshitz Cosmology with different matter content that is the dominant component of the Universe.

PACS numbers: 98.80.Cq

I. INTRODUCTION

Searching for a quantum theory of gravity has been a fruitful field for theoretical physics in the last century. In this sense, Hořava proposed in Ref. [1] a new quantizable theory of gravity, using the ideas from solid states physics. This theory was originally called Hořava-Lifshitz quantum gravity, that is a power-counting renormalizable theory with consistent ultraviolet (UV) behavior and, on the other hand, the theory has one fixed point in the infrared limit (IR), namely General Relativity [1–4]. Thus, this theory leads to a modification of the Einstein's general relativity at high energies producing interesting features in cosmology. The first ideas about this subject have been presented in Refs. [5–7] , where the cosmological consequences of Hořava-Lifshitz cosmology were studied in a vast detail, see also Refs. [8–25]. The new theory has virtues and defects, and its basis is basic ideas are not free of controversy [26]. In this article we would like to address an interesting point concerning HL cosmology that is still an open problem. In particular, we are seeing a behavior of HL cosmology for different kinds of matter content of the universe, such as dust, cosmological constant and phantom matter. The present paper is organized as follows. In Sec. I we discuss the Horava-Lifshitz cosmology for different kinds of the matter and also we present general settings and constrains in the theory. In Sec. II we analyze the role of stiff-like matter taken as the dominant at early times. Finally, in Sec. III we give some final remarks.

II. HOŘAVA-LIFSHITZ COSMOLOGY

Let us first to introduce a cosmological model under consideration, based on Ref. [27]. It is well-known that in Hořava-Lifshitz gravity we do not have the Hamiltonian constraint and therefore, from the formal cosmological point of view, also we do not have one Friedmann equation as in standard cosmology. Our starting point is the dynamical equation for flat FRW spacetime

$$\eta\left(2\dot{H}+3H^2\right)=-p, \tag{1}$$

where we introduced a parameter

$$\eta=\frac{1}{2}\left(3\lambda-1\right), \tag{2}$$

and λ represents a dimensionless constant. The value of λ is fixed by the diffeomorsphism invariance of four-dimensional general relativity. At this point, we would like to emphasize that in HL cosmology any value of the constant λ is consistent with a foliation that preserves the diffeomorphism invariance. For example, it was shown in Ref. [28] that for $1/3 < \lambda < 1$ (or equivalently $0 < \eta < 1$) the scalar graviton is a ghost. An is absence of ghosts if $\lambda < 1/3$ (that is $\eta < 0$) and $\lambda > 1$ (or $\eta > 1$). The field equation for matter fields is described by an energy non-conservation equation, and at high energy limit, or early times limit, we can write it in the following form

$$\dot{\rho} + 3H(\rho + P) = -Q. \tag{3}$$

Here Q represents the rate of energy non-conservation, and the low energy limit can be take only if $Q \to 0$. We can concluded that the energy non-conservation is an effect of high-energy physics. Now, equations (1) and (3) contain enough information to describe a cosmological evolution of the spacetime, together with the equation of state $p = \omega\rho$. Indeed, usinf this dynamical equation plus the non-conservation equation, we can obtain one first integral in the form

$$3H^2 = \frac{1}{\eta}\rho + \frac{C\left(t\right)}{a^3}. \tag{4}$$

That result can be interpreted as a Friedmann equation in HL gravity and the integration "constant" is given by

$$C\left(t\right) = C_0 + \frac{1}{\eta}\int_{t_0}^{t} d\tau a^3\left(\tau\right)Q\left(\tau\right). \tag{5}$$

In order to obtain a cosmological description of this kind of theories, we would like to discuss first some known results from GR in the context of HL cosmology. The subscript 0 indicates quantities today (t_0).

- **Dust matter:** $p = 0 \longleftrightarrow \omega = 0$

In this case, from (1) we find exactly the same solution for the Hubble parameter as in GR, i.e.,

$$H\left(t\right) = H_0\left[1 + \frac{3}{2}H_0\left(t - t_0\right)\right]^{-1}, \tag{6}$$

and for the cosmic scale factor reads

$$a\left(t\right) = a_0\left[1 + \frac{3}{2}H_0\left(t - t_0\right)\right]^{2/3}. \tag{7}$$

In GR, it is well-known that, when $\omega = 0$, an evolution is described by an energy density proportional to a^{-3} and a formal solution identical to Eqs. (6) and (7) can be obtained.

However, in HL cosmology the energy density is not fixed by the non-conservation equation (3). Additionally, we would like to metion that (6) and (7) are also solutions of (1) if we set $\rho = 0$ and η is finite. Thus, these equations can also be seen as a self-decelerated evolution. In a nutshell, both $\omega = 0$ and $\rho = 0$ lead to the same solutions described by Eqs. (6) and (7).

Therefore, in case of dust matter we found that the effect of high energy physics is reflected in the fact that during the early stages, the rate of energy non-conservation is not constant $Q(t) \neq 0$, and we have an interchange of energy the between the mater of the universe and some unknown source.

- **Cosmological constant:** $\omega = -1$**.**

In this case, the conservation law reads

$$\dot{\rho} = -Q, \tag{8}$$

and we recover GR in the limit $Q\left(a \to \infty\right) \to 0$, i.e., $\rho = const.$. This is the "role" of the cosmological constant in HL gravity.

- **Phantom Evolution.**

In this case, starting from (1) we can write the following formal solution for the Hubble parameter

$$H^2\left(a\right) = \frac{1}{a^3}\left(a_0^3 H_0^2 - \frac{\omega}{\eta}\int_{a_0}^{a} da a^2 \rho\left(a\right)\right), \tag{9}$$

and if we take $\rho\left(a\right) = \rho_0\left(a/a_0\right)^{\beta}$ and $\beta > 1$, we get

$$H^2\left(a\right) = H_0^2\left(\frac{a_0}{a}\right)^3\left[1 - \frac{\omega\rho_0/3H_0^2}{\eta\left(1+\beta/3\right)}\left[\left(\frac{a}{a_0}\right)^{\beta+3} - 1\right]\right], \tag{10}$$

and

$$H^2\left(a \to \infty\right) = -\frac{\omega\rho_0/3}{\eta\left(1+\beta/3\right)}\left(\frac{a_0}{a}\right)^{\beta}, \tag{11}$$

so that, necessarily $\omega < 0$. By setting

$$\left|\omega\right|\rho_0/3H_0^2 = \left(1+\beta/3\right)\eta, \tag{12}$$

we obtain the phantom solution given by

$$a\left(t\right) = a_0\left(\frac{2}{\beta H_0}\right)^{2/\beta}\left(t_s - t\right)^{-2/\beta} \quad and \quad t_s = t_0 + \frac{2}{\beta H_0}. \tag{13}$$

It is worthwhile noticing that the solution (13) has a new region for the phantom evolution for the barotropic index $\omega < 0$ instead of the usual, more restrictive one $\omega < -1$. We also notice that if $\eta \to \infty, then \beta \to -3$ and we can write

$$H^2 \left(a\right)_{\eta \to \infty} \to H_0^2 \left(\frac{a_0}{a}\right)^3, \tag{14}$$

so that the phantom approach has no sense. According to

$$\eta = |\omega| \left(\rho_0/3H_0^2\right) \left(1 + \beta/3\right)^{-1} > 1, \tag{15}$$

or

$$|\omega| \left(\rho_0/3H_0^2\right) > 1 + \beta/3, \tag{16}$$

we concluded that the observational data do not allow fulfill the last inequality. On the other hand, if $0 < \eta < 1$ (ghost scalar graviton), we have $|\omega| \left(\rho_0/3H_0^2\right) < 1 + \beta/3$, and in this case we can have a phantom phase, provided we can accept an existence of a ghost scalar graviton.

- **General Settings.**

We are now interested in the limit $\eta \to \infty$ $(\lambda \to \infty)$ [28]. In this case, we can distinguish several situations. For instance, if p is finite and $\eta \to \infty$, from (1) we obtain exactly the same solution A giveN by (6) and (7), and the Hubble parameter becomes in this limit

$$3H^2 = \frac{C_0}{a^3}, \tag{17}$$

thus, a dust-like evolution with p do not vanish. We would like to notice that, if $t \to \infty$ and η is finite, then

$$3H^2 \left(t \to \infty\right) \to \frac{1}{\eta} \rho \left(t \to \infty\right) + \frac{1}{a^3 \left(t \to \infty\right)} \left[C_0 + \frac{1}{\eta} \int_{t_0}^{\infty} d\tau a^3 \left(\tau\right) Q \left(\tau\right)\right] = \frac{1}{\eta} \rho \left(t \to \infty\right), \tag{18}$$

if at least $Q\left(t\right)$ decreases as $a^{-4}\left(t\right)$ when $a\left(t \to \infty\right) \to \infty$. This condition on Q is consistent with the recovering of local invariance for the matter sector, where it is demanded that $Q\left(a \to \infty\right) \to 0$ and $C\left(t \to \infty\right) \to C_0$ (see [28]). Then, this is the only information about $Q\left(t_0\right)$, that we can obtain. Therefore, our evolution equation for later times is given by

$$3H_0^2 = \frac{1}{\eta} \rho_0 + \frac{C_0}{a^3}. \tag{19}$$

On the other hand, from (1) and (4) we can write

$$\dot{H} = -\frac{1}{2}\frac{C_0}{a^3} - \frac{1}{2\eta}\left[\left(1+\omega\right)\rho + \frac{1}{a^3}\int_{t_0}^{t} d\tau a^3\left(\tau\right)Q\left(\tau\right)\right], \tag{20}$$

so that if we take the limit $\eta \to \infty$, and keep finite second term in (20), we obtain

$$H\left(a\right) = H_0\sqrt{1 + \frac{C_0 a_0^{-3}}{3H_0^2}\left[\left(\frac{a_0}{a}\right)^3 - 1\right]}. \tag{21}$$

Furthermore, if $C_0 a_0^{-3}/3H_0^2 < 1$, we find

$$H\left(a \to \infty\right) \to H_0\sqrt{1 - \frac{C_0 a_0^{-3}}{3H_0^2}} < H_0. \tag{22}$$

To conclude, in case with $\eta \to \infty$ we find a de Sitter phase at late times. We also notice that this behavior can also be obtained if we choose $\omega = -1$ but keep η finite, that is,

$$\dot{H} = -\frac{1}{2}\frac{C\left(t\right)}{a^3} \to \dot{H}\left(t \to \infty\right) \to 0, \tag{23}$$

given that in this limit $C\left(t \to \infty\right) \to C_0$. In another words, taking either $\eta \to \infty$, for all t, and or $t \to \infty$ and η finite, we arrive to a de Sitter phase at late times.

To complete this point, we would like to comment about the acceleration of universe. By using the expression for $\dot{H}$, as well as (4), we can write

$$\dot{H} + H^2 = -\frac{1}{6\eta}\left[\left(1+3\omega\right)\rho + \eta\frac{C\left(t\right)}{a^3}\right], \tag{24}$$

and it is straightforward to check that $\eta = 1$ plus $C\left(t\right) = 0$ implies the standard expression for the acceleration in GR. Also, if $\dot{H} + H^2 > 0$, we must have $\omega < -1/3$, to avoid violating the weak energy condition (WEC) $\rho > 0$. Then, we can have quintessence, cosmological constant or phantom schemes. Now, if $\dot{H} + H^2 < 0$ then $\omega > -1/3$ the WEC is fulfilled, then we have an evolution driven by dark matter. Finally when $\dot{H} + H^2 = 0$ we obtain the solution

$$H\left(t\right) = H_0\left[1 + H_0\left(t - t_0\right)\right]^{-1}, \tag{25}$$

i.e., $\omega = -1/3$ (string gas) as in GR. As a curiosity we notice that

$$\left(\dot{H} + H^2\right)_{\omega=-1/3} = \frac{1}{3}\left(\dot{H}\right)_{\omega=-1}. \tag{26}$$

Finally, by setting $\dot{H}+H^2=0$, we can write the following expression for the density of energy

$$\rho\left(t\right)=\rho_0\left(a/a_0\right)^{-3}+\frac{1}{\eta\left|1+3\omega\right|}\frac{1}{a^3}\int_{t_0}^{t}d\tau a^3\left(\tau\right)Q\left(\tau\right), \tag{27}$$

where $C_0=\left|1+3\omega\right|\rho_0a_0^{-3}$ and $\omega<-1/3$, and we find that $\rho\left(t\rightarrow\infty\right)\rightarrow\rho_0\left(a/a_0\right)^{-3}$, i. e., a dust-like behaviour at late times is driven by a ω that is dark energy-like.

III. STIFF-LIKE MATTER AS THE DOMINANT TERM AT EARLY TIMES

In this section we are explicitly including the curvature effect and through the term of the form $\sim a^{-6}$ in the equations, that is, a new equation to handle is

$$3\eta H^2=\rho-\frac{\alpha k^3}{a^6}. \tag{28}$$

Similarly as before, the parameter η can take any value in HL cosmology. The dynamical equation, therefore can be written as

$$\eta\left(2\dot{H}+3H^2\right)=-\omega\rho+\frac{\alpha k^3}{a^6}, \tag{29}$$

where α is a constant and k is the spatial curvature. From Eq. (28), it follows that, if $k=-1$, there is the constraint $\rho\left(a\right)>\alpha a^{-6}$. From Eqs. (28) and (29) we obtain the conservation law

$$\dot{\rho}+3H\left(1+\omega\right)\rho=0, \tag{30}$$

as well as the equation

$$\dot{H}+3H^2=\frac{1}{2\eta}\left(1-\omega\right)\rho. \tag{31}$$

Furthemore, taking $\omega=1$ (usual stiff matter; $p=\rho$) we find the following solution for the Hubble parameter and the scale factor, respectively,

$$H\left(t\right)=H_0\left[1+3H_0\left(t-t_0\right)\right]^{-1}, \tag{32}$$

and

$$a\left(t\right)=a_0\left[1+3H_0\left(t-t_0\right)\right]^{1/3}. \tag{33}$$

In order to the implications of this result, we are compare it to standard GR, and the equations $3H^2=\rho$ and $\dot{\rho}+6H\rho=0$ ($\omega=1$) that lead (32) and (33). Thus replacing (32) and (33) in (28), we obtain for $\omega=1$

$$3\eta H^2=\left(\rho_0\pm\alpha a_0^{-6}\right)\left(a_0/a\right)^6. \tag{34}$$

Since the curvature of the spatial section is $k = \mp 1$, the last equation gives a bounf $\alpha < \rho_0 a_0^6$, and from (30) we get

$$\rho\left(a\right) = \rho_0 \left(a_0/a\right)^{3(1+\omega)}. \tag{35}$$

Furthermore, replacing (35) into (28) yields

$$H^2\left(a\right) = \frac{\rho_0}{3\eta}\left[\left(\frac{a_0}{a}\right)^{3(\omega-1)} - \frac{\alpha k^3}{\rho_0 a_0^6}\right]\left(\frac{a_0}{a}\right)^6, \tag{36}$$

and the positivity of H leads to (for $k = 1$)

$$a < a_0^{(\omega+1)/(\omega-1)}\left(\frac{\rho_0}{\alpha}\right)^{1/3(\omega-1)}. \tag{37}$$

We conclude that there is an upper bound for a. On the other hand, if we take $\omega = -1$, we obtain

$$a > \left(\frac{\alpha}{\rho_0}\right)^{1/6}, \tag{38}$$

i.e., a is bounded from below.

Finally, we want to analyze a Universe that contains a mixture of a stiff-like matter and cosmological constant,

$$3\eta H^2 = \rho - \frac{\alpha k^3}{a^6} + \Lambda, \tag{39}$$

and

$$\eta\left(2\dot{H} + 3H^2\right) = -\omega\rho + \frac{\alpha k^3}{a^6} + \Lambda. \tag{40}$$

In consequence, we obtain the equation

$$\dot{H} + 3H^2 = \frac{1}{2\eta}\left[\left(1-\omega\right)\rho + 2\Lambda\right]. \tag{41}$$

For $\omega = 1$, the solution is

$$H\left(t\right) = \sqrt{\Lambda/3\eta}\left(\frac{1 + \Delta_0 \exp\left[-2\sqrt{3\Lambda/\eta}\left(t - t_0\right)\right]}{1 - \Delta_0 \exp\left[-2\sqrt{3\Lambda/\eta}\left(t - t_0\right)\right]}\right), \tag{42}$$

where we denoted

$$\Delta_0 = \left(H_0 - \sqrt{\Lambda/3\eta}\right)\left(H_0 + \sqrt{\Lambda/3\eta}\right)^{-1}. \tag{43}$$

We concluded that, in case of the mixture between stiff-like matter and cosmological constant, the general solution is k-independent.

In what follows, we analyze the sgn(Δ_0) in order to discuss the cosmological evolution. For example, when $\Delta_0 = 0$, the Hubble constant is $H = \sqrt{\Lambda/3\eta} = const.$, that corresponds to the early de Sitter phase. Furthermore, we note that there is no singularity in $H\left(t\right)$ for $\Delta_0 > 0$. The deceleration parameter in GR is written as

$$q = -\left(1+\frac{\dot{H}}{H^2}\right) = \frac{1}{2}\left(1+3\omega\right) - \frac{1}{2}\left(\omega+1\right)\frac{\Lambda}{H^2}, \tag{44}$$

and in H-L, from Eqs. (39) and (40), as

$$q = \frac{1}{2}\left(1+3\omega\right) + \left(\omega-1\right)\frac{\alpha k^3}{\eta H^2 a^6} - \left(\omega+1\right)\frac{\Lambda}{2\eta H^2}, \tag{45}$$

again, if we use the stiff matter condition $\omega = 1$, from (44) we obtain

$$q = 2 - \frac{\Lambda}{H^2} \quad \left(GR\ at\ all\ the\ times\right), \tag{46}$$

whereas H^2 is given by (32), and from (45) we find

$$q = 2 - \frac{\Lambda}{\eta H^2} \quad \left(HLatearly\ times\right), \tag{47}$$

where H^2 is given by (42). We concluded from Eq. (45), $\omega = 1$ cancels the term containing α . Moreover, if we set $k = 0$, combining (39) and (40) we gives $H = const.$, this results if $\omega = -1$, matches GR result given that the "structure" of the equations are the same in both theories.

IV. FINAL REMARKS

In this article we study a cosmological model inspired by Hořava-Lifshitz cosmology scheme. We have found that the solution of the cosmological equation in Hořava-Lifshitz gravity, in case of the dust matter ($\omega = 0$), is exactly the same as one obtained in general relativity. However, a behavior of energy density is different than the one obtained in general relativity. We, also found a constraint that enables to determine the value C_0 from the observational data. At this point, we show that during the early universe, or at high energies, the equation that governs the matter evolution is a non energy conservation that contains an information about a kind of theory that we are dealing with. In the case of a the universe dominated by a cosmological constant we found an explicit solution for the Hubble parameter and that shows that its late behavior correspond to a de Sitter phases. On the other hand, for phantom matter we found that the corresponding interval for phantom evolution ($\omega < -1$) was changed by a new one that allows to cross this limit to $\omega < 0$.

Finally, for a general behavior of the barotropic index (arbitrary ω) that described the EoS of the matter. Furthermore, we showed that if we required a de Sitter phase at the late evolution of the universe, then the barotropic index is located in the phantom zone, $\omega < -1$, but for the matter that satisfies the strong energy condition ($\rho > 0$) in that cases, the Hubble parameter does not show any singularity, contrary to big rip that usually appears in case of phantom matter. We also discuss possible values of the parameters of the model. To complete our discussion, we study a behavior of the stiff-like matter as dominant at early times, and we obtain an upper bound and for the cosmological factor. However, in case of a mixture of stiff like matter and cosmological constant term our solution is independent on the curvature parameter.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work has been supported by COMISION NACIONAL DE CIENCIAS Y TECNOLOGIA through FONDECYT Grant 1110076, 1090613 and 1110230 (JS). This work was also partially supported by PUCV-VRIEA (SL) and PUCV grant No. 123.713/2012 (JS).

[1] P. Horava, Phys. Lett. B **694**, 172 (2010) [arXiv:0811.2217 [hep-th]].

[2] P. Horava, JHEP **0903**, 020 (2009) [arXiv:0812.4287 [hep-th]].

[3] P. Horava, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 161301 (2009) [arXiv:0902.3657 [hep-th]].

[4] P. Horava, Phys. Rev. D **79**, 084008 (2009) [arXiv:0901.3775 [hep-th]].

[5] G. Calcagni, JHEP **0909**, 112 (2009) [arXiv:0904.0829 [hep-th]].

[6] E. Kiritsis and G. Kofinas, Nucl. Phys. B **821**, 467 (2009) [arXiv:0904.1334 [hep-th]].

[7] T. Takahashi and J. Soda, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 231301 (2009) [arXiv:0904.0554 [hep-th]].

[8] S. 'i. Nojiri and S. D. Odintsov, Phys. Rept. **505**, 59 (2011) [arXiv:1011.0544 [gr-qc]].

[9] T. Clifton, P. G. Ferreira, A. Padilla and C. Skordis, Phys. Rept. **513**, 1 (2012) [arXiv:1106.2476 [astro-ph.CO]].

[10] R. Brandenberger, Phys. Rev. D **80**, 043516 (2009) [arXiv:0904.2835 [hep-th]].

[11] S. Mukohyama, JCAP **0906**, 001 (2009) [arXiv:0904.2190 [hep-th]].

[12] R. -G. Cai, B. Hu and H. -B. Zhang, Phys. Rev. D **80**, 041501 (2009) [arXiv:0905.0255 [hep-th]].

[13] E. N. Saridakis, Eur. Phys. J. C **67**, 229 (2010) [arXiv:0905.3532 [hep-th]].

[14] S. Mukohyama, K. Nakayama, F. Takahashi and S. Yokoyama, Phys. Lett. B **679**, 6 (2009) [arXiv:0905.0055 [hep-th]].

[15] S. Mukohyama, Phys. Rev. D **80**, 064005 (2009) [arXiv:0905.3563 [hep-th]].

[16] Y. -F. Cai and E. N. Saridakis, JCAP **0910**, 020 (2009) [arXiv:0906.1789 [hep-th]].

[17] A. Wang, D. Wands and R. Maartens, JCAP **1003**, 013 (2010) [arXiv:0909.5167 [hep-th]].

[18] G. Leon and E. N. Saridakis, JCAP **0911**, 006 (2009) [arXiv:0909.3571 [hep-th]].

[19] M. Minamitsuji, Phys. Lett. B **684**, 194 (2010) [arXiv:0905.3892 [astro-ph.CO]].

[20] S. Carloni, E. Elizalde and P. J. Silva, Class. Quant. Grav. **27**, 045004 (2010) [arXiv:0909.2219 [hep-th]].

[21] X. Gao, Y. Wang, W. Xue and R. Brandenberger, JCAP **1002**, 020 (2010) [arXiv:0911.3196 [hep-th]].

[22] T. Kobayashi, Y. Urakawa and M. Yamaguchi, JCAP **1004**, 025 (2010) [arXiv:1002.3101 [hep-th]].

[23] K. -i. Maeda, Y. Misonoh and T. Kobayashi, Phys. Rev. D **82**, 064024 (2010) [arXiv:1006.2739 [hep-th]].

[24] E. N. Saridakis, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D **20**, 1485 (2011) [arXiv:1101.0300 [astro-ph.CO]].

[25] O. Bertolami and C. A. D. Zarro, Phys. Rev. D **84**, 044042 (2011) [arXiv:1106.0126 [hep-th]].

[26] M. Henneaux, A. Kleinschmidt and G. Lucena Gomez, Phys. Rev. D **81**, 064002 (2010) [arXiv:0912.0399 [hep-th]].

[27] S. Mukohyama, Class. Quant. Grav. **27**, 223101 (2010) [arXiv:1007.5199 [hep-th]].

[28] A. E. Gumrukcuoglu and S. Mukohyama, Phys. Rev. D **83**, 124033 (2011) [arXiv:1104.2087 [hep-th]].